

alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 11, 1940, by the Mitchell Canneries, Inc., from Fort Meade, Fla.; and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: (Cans) "Crimson Tide Brand Tomatoes."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that it purported to be a food for which a standard of quality had been prescribed by regulations as provided by law; but its quality fell below such standard, and its label did not bear in such manner and form as the regulations specify, a statement that it fell below such standard.

On October 1, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1146. Adulteration of tomato catsup. U. S. v. 200 Cases of Tomato Catsup. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2152. Sample No. 12552-E.)

This product contained worm and insect fragments.

On or about June 11, 1940, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Texas filed a libel against 200 cases of tomato catsup at Harlingen, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 1, 1940, by the California Conserving Co., Inc., from San Francisco, Calif.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance. The article was labeled in part: "Monitor Brand Tomato Catsup."

On August 15, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1147. Adulteration and misbranding of tomato catsup. U. S. v. 107 Cases of Tomato Catsup. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2472. Sample No. 6312-E.)

This product contained worm and insect fragments.

On August 1, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of New Mexico filed a libel against 107 cases of tomato catsup at Albuquerque, N. Mex., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about March 27, 1940, by the Delta County Canning Co. from Delta, Colo.; and charging that it was adulterated and misbranded. It was labeled in part: (Bottles) "Bel-Dine Tomato Catsup Packed For Recorg Supply Corporation Chicago, Illinois."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy substance. It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement in the labeling, "All products Bearing This Label Are Guaranteed To Comply with the Pure Food Laws," was false and misleading.

On September 9, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1148. Adulteration of tomato catsup. U. S. v. 75 Cases of Tomato Catsup. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2748. Sample No. 6616-E.)

This product contained worm and insect fragments.

On September 11, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of New Mexico filed a libel against 75 cases of tomato catsup at Las Vegas, N. Mex. (consigned by the Delta County Canning Co.), alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about February 27 and March 5, 1940, from Delta, Colo., to Raton, N. Mex., thence to Las Vegas, N. Mex.; and charging that it was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance. The article was labeled in part: (Bottles) "Town Talk Tomato Catsup."

On October 9, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

Nos. 1149 to 1157, inclusive (except No. 1151), report the seizure and disposition of tomato products which contained excessive mold, indicating the presence of decomposed material. The tomato paste described in 1151 contained worm and insect fragments.

1149. Adulteration of tomato catsup. U. S. v. 51 Cases of Tomato Catsup. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 2306. Sample No. 26231-E.)

This product contained excessive mold indicating the presence of decomposed material.